

Holographic bound and spectrum of quantized black hole

I.B. Khriplovich¹

Budker Institute of Nuclear Physics
630090 Novosibirsk, Russia,
and Novosibirsk University

Abstract

Recent attempts to calculate the black-hole entropy in loop quantum gravity are demonstrated to be erroneous. The correct solution of the problem is pointed out.

PACS numbers: 04.60Pp, 04.60.Ds, 04.60.Nc, 03.65.Sq

The description of a quantized surface in loop quantum gravity (LQG) looks as follows (see, e.g. [1]). One ascribes to this surface a set of punctures, each of them supplied with an integer or half-integer quantum number j :

$$j = 1/2, 1, 3/2, \dots \quad (1)$$

This “angular momentum” j has as usual $2j + 1$ projections m :

$$m = -j, \dots, j. \quad (2)$$

The area of a surface in LQG is

$$A = 8\pi\gamma l_p^2 \sum_i \sqrt{j_i(j_i + 1)}. \quad (3)$$

The numerical factor γ in (3) cannot be determined without an additional physical input. This ambiguity originates from a free (so-called Barbero-Immirzi) parameter [2, 3] which corresponds to a family of inequivalent quantum theories, all of them being viable without such an input. Once the general structure of the horizon area in LQG is fixed, the problem is to determine this overall factor, i.e. the Barbero-Immirzi (BI) parameter.

First attempts to fix the value of this parameter by calculating the black hole entropy [4, 5] did not lead to concrete quantitative results.

Then it was argued in [6] that for the area of a black hole horizon one obtains all $j = 1/2$. With two possible projections $\pm 1/2$ for the quantum number j , the total number K of degenerate quantum states of the horizon is

$$K = 2^\nu. \quad (4)$$

¹khriplovich@inp.nsk.su

Correspondingly, its entropy is

$$S_{1/2} = \ln K = \nu \ln 2. \quad (5)$$

From it, with the Bekenstein-Hawking relation

$$S = \frac{A}{4l_p^2}, \quad (6)$$

one obtains the following value for the BI parameter:

$$\gamma = \frac{\ln 2}{\pi\sqrt{3}} = 0.127. \quad (7)$$

However, this result of [6] was demonstrated in [7] to be certainly incorrect since it violates the holographic bound formulated in [8-10].

Later, the result of [6] was also criticized and revised in [11, 12], with the conclusion that the number of the relevant horizon states is underestimated in [6]. The value of the BI parameter, as calculated in [12], is

$$\gamma = 0.238. \quad (8)$$

In the present note I demonstrate that the results of [11, 12] are also in conflict with the holographic bound. Besides, an apparent error in state counting made in [11, 12] is pointed out.

But first of all on the holographic bound itself. According to it, the entropy S of any spherically symmetric system confined inside a sphere of area A is bounded as follows:

$$S \leq \frac{A}{4l_p^2}, \quad (9)$$

with the equality attained only for a system which is a black hole. This result can be formulated otherwise. Among the spherical surfaces of a given area, it is the surface of a black hole horizon that has the largest entropy.

A simple intuitive argument confirming bound (9) is as follows [10]. Let us allow the discussed system to collapse into a black hole. During the collapse the entropy increases from S to S_{bh} , and the resulting horizon area A_{bh} is certainly smaller than the initial confining one A . Now, with the account for the Bekenstein-Hawking relation (6) for a black hole, we arrive, through the obvious chain of (in)equalities:

$$S \leq S_{bh} = \frac{A_{bh}}{4l_p^2} \leq \frac{A}{4l_p^2},$$

at the discussed bound (9).

In fact, the correct value of the BI parameter γ was obtained by us few years ago [13](see also [7, 14]). Our derivation was based exactly on the requirement that the surface of a black hole horizon should have maximum entropy.

To substantiate our objections to the results of [6, 11, 12], I sketch below the derivation of our result (for more technical details see [13]).

We consider the “microcanonical” entropy S of a surface (though with a fixed area, instead of fixed energy). The entropy is defined as the logarithm of the number of states of this surface with a fixed area A .

To analyze the problem, it is convenient to rewrite formula (3) as follows:

$$A = 8\pi\gamma l_p^2 \sum_{jm} \sqrt{j(j+1)} \nu_{jm}. \quad (10)$$

Here ν_{jm} is the number of punctures with given j and m . It can be demonstrated [7, 14] that the only reasonable assumption on the distinguishability of punctures that may result in acceptable physical predictions, complying both with the Bekenstein-Hawking relation and with the holographic bound, is as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{nonequal } j, \quad \text{any } m &\longrightarrow \text{distinguishable;} \\ \text{equal } j, \quad \text{nonequal } m &\longrightarrow \text{distinguishable;} \\ \text{equal } j, \quad \text{equal } m &\longrightarrow \text{indistinguishable.} \end{aligned}$$

Under this assumption, the number of states of the horizon surface for a given ν_{jm} , is obviously

$$K = \nu! \prod_{jm} \frac{1}{\nu_{jm}!}, \quad \nu = \sum_j \nu_j = \sum_{jm} \nu_{jm}, \quad (11)$$

and the corresponding entropy equals

$$S = \ln K = \ln(\nu!) - \sum_{jm} \ln(\nu_{jm}!). \quad (12)$$

The structures of the last expression and of formula (10) are so different that in a general case the entropy certainly cannot be proportional to the area. However, this is the case for the maximum entropy in the classical limit.

In the classical limit, with all effective “occupation numbers” large, $\nu_{jm} \gg 1$, the entropy in the Stirling approximation is

$$S = \nu \ln \nu - \sum_{jm} \nu_{jm} \ln \nu_{jm}. \quad (13)$$

We calculate its maximum value for a fixed area A , i.e. for a fixed sum

$$N = \sum_{jm} \sqrt{j(j+1)} \nu_{jm} = \text{const.} \quad (14)$$

The problem reduces to the solution of the system of equations

$$\ln \nu - \ln \nu_{jm} = \mu \sqrt{j(j+1)}, \quad (15)$$

where μ is the Lagrange multiplier for the constraining relation (14). These equations can be rewritten as

$$\nu_{jm} = \nu e^{-\mu \sqrt{j(j+1)}}, \quad (16)$$

or

$$\nu_j = (2j + 1) e^{-\mu\sqrt{j(j+1)}} \nu. \quad (17)$$

Now we sum expressions (17) over j , and with $\sum_j \nu_j = \nu$ arrive at the equation for μ

$$\sum_{j=1/2}^{\infty} (2j + 1) e^{-\mu\sqrt{j(j+1)}} = 1, \quad (18)$$

with the solution

$$\mu = 1.722. \quad (19)$$

On the other hand, when multiplying equation (15) by ν_{jm} and summing over jm , we arrive with the constraint (14) at the following result for the maximum entropy for a given value of N :

$$S_{\max} = 1.722 N, \quad (20)$$

so that with the Bekenstein-Hawking relation and formula (10) we find the value of the BI parameter²:

$$\gamma = 0.274. \quad (21)$$

Let us come back now to the results (7) and (8). If one agrees that the BI parameter is universal (i.e. its value is not special to black holes, but refers to any quantized spherical surface), then it is self-obvious that the results of [6, 11, 12] are in conflict with the holographic bound and therefore incorrect. Indeed, with relations (2) and (3) valid for a generic quantized spherical surface (be it an horizon or not) this is our solution (21) that describes a black hole since just it corresponds to the maximum entropy.

The error made in [6] has been acknowledged recently [16], so we do not discuss anymore the result (7). However, it would be useful to indicate an apparent error in state counting made in [11, 12]. It can be easily checked that the transition from formula (25) to formulae (29), (36) of [11] performed therein and then employed in [12], is certainly valid under the assumption that for each quantum number j only two maximum projections $\pm j$ are allowed, instead of $2j + 1$. No wonder therefore that the equation for the BI parameter in [12] looks as

$$2 \sum_{j=1/2}^{\infty} e^{-\mu\sqrt{j(j+1)}} = 1, \quad (22)$$

instead of ours (18) (see also the discussion of (22) in [15]).

The conclusion is obvious. Any restriction on the number of admissible states for the horizon, as compared to a generic quantized surface, be it the restriction to

$$j = 1/2, \quad m = \pm 1/2,$$

made in [6], or the restriction to

$$\text{any } j, \quad m = \pm j,$$

made in [11, 12], results in a conflict with the holographic bound.

²Quite recently this calculation with the same result, though with somewhat different motivation, was reproduced in [15].

I truly appreciate the kind hospitality extended to me at School of Physics, University of New South Wales, Sydney, where the major part of this work was done. I am sincerely grateful to O.P. Sushkov for the warm invitation to UNSW and for useful discussions.

The investigation was supported in part by the Russian Foundation for Basic Research through Grant No.03-02-17612.

References

- [1] Ashtekar A and Lewandowski J 1997 *Class. Quantum Grav.* **14** 55
(*Preprint* gr-qc/9602046)
- [2] Immirzi G 1997 *Class. Quantum Grav.* **14** L177 (*Preprint* gr-qc/9701052)
- [3] Rovelli C and Thiemann T 1998 *Phys. Rev.* **D57** 1009 (*Preprint* gr-qc/970559)
- [4] Rovelli C 1996 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **77** 3288 (*Preprint* gr-qc/9603063)
- [5] Krasnov K V 1997 *Phys. Rev.* **D55** 3505 (*Preprint* gr-qc/9603025);
Krasnov K V 1998 *Gen. Rel. Grav.* **30** 53 (*Preprint* gr-qc/9605047);
Krasnov K V 1999 *Class. Quantum Grav.* **16** 563 (*Preprint* gr-qc/9710006)
- [6] Ashtekar A, Baez J, Corichi A and Krasnov K 1998 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **80** 904
(*Preprint* gr-qc/9710007)
- [7] Khriplovich I B 2004 *Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz.* **126** 527
[*Sov. Phys. JETP* **99** 460] (*Preprint* gr-qc/0404083)
- [8] Bekenstein J D 1981 *Phys. Rev.* **D23** 287
- [9] 't Hooft G 1993 in *Salam Festschrift* Singapore (*Preprint* gr-qc/9310026)
- [10] Susskind L 1995 *J. Math. Phys.* **36** 6377 (*Preprint* gr-qc/9710007)
- [11] Lewandowski J, Domagala M 2004 *Class. Quantum Grav.* **21** 5233
(*Preprint* gr-qc/0407051)
- [12] Meissner K 2004 *Class. Quantum Grav.* **21** 5245 (*Preprint* gr-qc/0407052)
- [13] Korkin R V, Khriplovich I B 2002 *Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz.* **122** 1
[*Sov. Phys. JETP* **95** 1] (*Preprint* gr-qc/0112074)
- [14] Khriplovich I B 2004 (*Preprint* gr-qc//0409031)
- [15] Ghosh A, Mitra P 2004 (*Preprint* gr-qc//0411035)
- [16] Ashtekar A 2004 (*Preprint* gr-qc/0410054)